

# **Exhibit A**

In the United States District Court  
For the Northern District of Georgia  
Atlanta Division

Intellectual Ventures  
II, LLC,

Plaintiff,

VS.

Civil Action File  
No. 1:13-CV-02454-WSD

SunTrust Banks, Inc.,  
Et al.,

Defendants.

- - -

Transcript of teleconference call proceedings

Before THE HON. WILLIAM S. DUFFEY, JR.,

United States District Court Judge

August 14, 2014

Atlanta, Georgia.

- - -

APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL:

For the Plaintiff: Elizabeth Day, Attorney at Law  
Marc Belloli, Esq.  
Zahra Karinshak

For the Defendants: Ken Adamo, Esq.  
Ann Fort, Attorney at Law  
Natasha Moffitt, Attorney at Law  
Eugene Paige, Esq.

Reported by:

Elizabeth G. Cohn, RMR, CRR  
Official Court Reporter  
United States District Court  
(404) 215-1573

1 (Thursday, August 14, 2014, 11:05 a.m.)

2 THE COURT: Good morning.

3 MS. DAY: Good morning.

4 MS. FORT: Good morning.

5 MR. ADAMO: Good morning.

6 THE COURT: I guess it's really a good morning, early  
7 good morning for the people representing Intellectual Ventures,  
8 except for Ms. Karinshak. I guess it's early out in  
9 California.

10 Do we have Ms. Day and Mr. Belloli on for us?

11 MR. BELLOLI: This is Mr. Belloli. We do, Your  
12 Honor.

13 THE COURT: And Ms. Karinshak, are you on?

14 MS. KARINSHAK: Yes, Your Honor.

15 THE COURT: And for SunTrust Banks, do we have Mr.  
16 Adamo, Ms. Fort, Ms. Moffitt, and Mr. Paige?

17 MR. ADAMO: Yes, Your Honor.

18 MS. FORT: Good morning.

19 MS. MOFFITT: Yes, Your Honor.

20 MR. PAIGE: Mr. Paige, Your Honor. Good morning.

21 THE COURT: This is a call that I've scheduled  
22 because of the e-mail that I received on the 28th of July from  
23 Ms. Fort in which there is announced that there is a discovery  
24 dispute in the case. And I guess I interpreted it as there  
25 being some anxiety about managing the case and conducting

1 discovery in light of the pending motion to stay.

2 And now having caught my breath after a pretty busy  
3 week, so I thought we could have a discussion about the case.  
4 And I want to fill you in on some things that I have been doing  
5 in the interim to try to get a handle on, on the management of  
6 the case.

7 It is true that there's a pending motion to stay. It  
8 is true that I have not gotten to that. But I'm just trying to  
9 prioritize our work here. And as you probably know, we have  
10 many dockets here these days. And as of last week, we've lost  
11 another district court judge, so we're pretty shorthanded. And  
12 so I'm having to do more prioritization than normal.

13 There are a number of pending criminal cases that I  
14 have that have to be tried and those, of course, take  
15 precedent. And I will admit that I have spent a fair amount of  
16 time trying to manage those to try to get them in a position so  
17 that they can be resolved, including some by trial. So that's  
18 one of the reasons why it's taken me longer than I prefer to  
19 get to the pending motions.

20 But before I discuss that and where we are, let me  
21 tell you some additional thinking I've had about these cases  
22 and the communications I've had with the other courts that are  
23 presiding over the other Intellectual Ventures cases. And,  
24 admittedly, I've been the moving force behind those  
25 communications and discussions because of this underlying

1 concern I have, now having reviewed the chart, that I think  
2 either Ms. Day or I thought somebody on the plaintiff's side  
3 gave me a comparison of the various cases and what claims were  
4 in dispute and how those compared to the claims in dispute in  
5 the SunTrust case. And that was helpful to me. Whoever  
6 provided that, I thank you for that.

7 And then there was a separate chart comparing the  
8 construction issues in this case and the various positions and  
9 the positions of the two parties in the case. I'm pretty sure  
10 I asked for this, compared that to Judge Hellerstein's claim  
11 construction order. And then if I look at the chart that was  
12 provided which was attached as Exhibit A that was sent to me, I  
13 think I have a pretty good handle on what, what terms were also  
14 at issue in the other cases.

15 And from all of that, it struck me that there was --  
16 there are an awful lot of judges across the country  
17 interpreting the same terms. And I think I expressed that in  
18 our last conversation.

19 I know Judge Hellerstein. I've talked to him twice  
20 about his case and his status and his management of it and the  
21 decisions he's made independent of decisions that others have  
22 made but how he got where he got, and so I understand that, and  
23 how he's managed his litigation. But there still is this  
24 duplication of judges across the country interpreting exactly  
25 the same terms in different stand-alone litigation.

1           And I have two philosophical evaluations of that.  
2       One is, it certainly is, on a very practical matter,  
3       inefficient to have judges across the country in I guess what  
4       are now eight cases interpreting the same terms, to the extent  
5       that, you know, whoever interprets them first, that that might  
6       inform some later judge as how they should be interpreted. And  
7       it helps, I guess, makes it somewhat more efficient. But just  
8       looking at the terms in this case, I'm not sure you're going to  
9       have necessarily one judge center position being wholesale  
10      adopted by another judge, especially in an area of this where  
11      none of us are really well versed or educated in the kinds of  
12      technologies that are at issue here. So I still have this  
13      practical efficiency question.

14           The greater concern I have where there's a, where  
15      there are patents in dispute, multiple patents in dispute in  
16      multiple cases, that it just seems -- I don't know what the  
17      right adjective is, but it just doesn't seem to be consistent  
18      with what we try to -- with what we try to do as courts to  
19      provide consistency and precedential value where you run the  
20      risk, as I think we do here, of inconsistent interpretations of  
21      exactly the same phrases in a patent.

22           And after our last conversation, which I think part  
23      of my fault was that it didn't go especially well, but I tried  
24      to drop back and say, what is the best thing to do with respect  
25      to these cases to, one, promote judicial economy and to do so

1 in a way that would provide guidance to whatever additional  
2 cases are filed on these patents to facilitate a resolution of  
3 those without having some later judge say, my goodness, there  
4 are four different interpretations of the same phrase and they  
5 are all slightly either nuance differences or they are  
6 substantive differences. And those prior opinions and  
7 interpretations don't help me one bit. Certainly doesn't help  
8 the parties.

9 So I went back and looked at the Multidistrict  
10 Litigation Rules and the Statute and have had a conversation  
11 with a member of the Panel, because there is a mechanism by  
12 which judges can request the Panel to consolidate cases into an  
13 MDL. But I've not done that yet, although I have talked to all  
14 the other judges, and they allowed me to have that conversation  
15 with the Panel to get their reaction to what -- how that would  
16 be responded to if, in fact, that request was made.

17 So all I've done is, is, is to get intelligence from  
18 the Panel as far as what their process would be for considering  
19 such a request and had they done it in the past. And I'll tell  
20 you that it's not often done, but it has been done, sometimes  
21 successfully and sometimes unsuccessfully. It just depends  
22 upon what the Panel's view is.

23 So while we have that information now and, and we can  
24 explore it as an option, I've reported my conversation with the  
25 other judges presiding over these cases. But we -- that's as

1 far as we've gotten, mainly because most of the cases are  
2 stayed, and -- with the exception of Judge Hellerstein's, and  
3 his is not stayed because he's invested in the case and has  
4 moved forward.

5 It has -- actually has no opinion about, about the  
6 idea of maybe doing something that would result in a  
7 consolidation, however that might occur, but wants me to keep  
8 him abreast of what developed in some of the other cases. And  
9 that's how we concluded our last conversation.

10 So that's, that's by full disclosure to you of what  
11 I've been doing in working with the other judges behind the  
12 scenes to let you know specifically that no decision has been  
13 made with respect to anything. And the one thing that I don't  
14 have any control over and where there's been at least one judge  
15 who has said it's a consolidation issue make any sense at all  
16 and accomplish what I want to accomplish where it would be hard  
17 to consolidate now state cases, or at least it would make it  
18 less attractive to the MDL Panel.

19 My personal opinion, if I said, oh, by the way, we'd  
20 like to consolidate those, but there's only two cases that  
21 aren't stayed at the moment -- well, maybe three. I think that  
22 just predicting their response would be, well, doesn't  
23 consolidation make more sense after the inter partes review has  
24 been to see what, in fact, is yet to be decided and then look  
25 at the overlap to see whether there is some more comprehensive



1 way in which the terms can be dealt with, whether in some sort  
2 of consolidated proceeding. So --

3 MR. ADAMO: Your Honor, excuse me for interrupting.  
4 It's Ken Adamo from Kirkland and Ellis. And I believe most of  
5 the charts that you were referring to were materials that we  
6 put together. As the Court may recall, Ms. Day and I are both  
7 involved in all of the other cases. I am co-counsel with other  
8 firms with respect to the other cases.

9 Is Your Honor aware that Judge Hellerstein ruled on  
10 the stay motion a few days ago, the one that was in front of  
11 him?

12 THE COURT: Yes. He let me know that.

13 MR. ADAMO: All right. And the -- that motion and  
14 the motion in front of Your Honor were the only two that have  
15 not been ruled on so far.

16 The U.S. Bank motion was granted by and stayed by  
17 Magistrate Judge Mayeron several weeks ago. I just wanted to  
18 make sure that Your Honor was aware of the status of things in  
19 front of Judge Hellerstein.

20 THE COURT: No. I'm fully aware of what he's done,  
21 and he keeps me abreast of what he's entered.

22 I thought there was one other case where a motion for  
23 stay had not yet been made in the Capital One Finance  
24 Corporation case.

25 MR. ADAMO: That's the one that -- yes, that's the

1 case that's pending in Southern Maryland recently filed, Judge  
2 -- Southern District of Maryland, and Judge Grimm has that one,  
3 Your Honor. That's true, there's been no stay motion filed  
4 there.

5 THE COURT: Okay.

6 MR. ADAMO: Just to update you a little more on the  
7 status of things in front of Judge Hellerstein, a motion to  
8 stay that case pending an interlocutory appeal was filed on  
9 August 12th. It's docket number 156 in front of Judge  
10 Hellerstein. And yesterday, notice of interlocutory appeal  
11 docket 157 was also filed in front of Judge Hellerstein and, as  
12 of this morning, the court in Southern New York has transmitted  
13 those appeal papers to the United States Court of Appeals for  
14 the Federal Circuit.

15 THE COURT: Okay.

16 MR. ADAMO: That's the full status of what is going  
17 on in Judge Hellerstein's court at the moment.

18 THE COURT: So what's the timetable, if anybody can  
19 predict it, for the Federal Circuit to decide a motion like  
20 that?

21 MR. ADAMO: There is a recent case, Your Honor, that  
22 was just recorded, Virtual Agility in the Federal Circuit --  
23 bear with me one second. I've got the timetable in this mess  
24 here somewhere.

25 In Virtual Agility, the appeal from the denial by

1 Judge Gilstrap in Eastern Texas, a stay motion was docketed  
2 January 14th of this year. A motion to stay in District Court  
3 and to expedite that appeal was filed in the Federal Circuit on  
4 June -- January 22nd, 2014. The motion to expedite the appeal  
5 was granted on January 30th, 2014. The first brief was filed  
6 January 31st, 2014. The motion to stay in the District Court  
7 was granted February 12th, 2014. And the Panel in appeal  
8 2014-1232 handed down a precedential opinion written by Circuit  
9 Judge Moore on July 10th, 2014. So from start to finish, from  
10 docket to opinion, Your Honor, it's about six months.

11 THE COURT: Yeah.

12 MR. ADAMO: February, March, April, May, June, July,  
13 six months, Your Honor. Docketed January, decision rendered  
14 July 10th of 2014.

15 THE COURT: Okay.

16 MR. BELLOLI: Your Honor, this is Marc Belloli for  
17 Intellectual Ventures. And the one thing I'd like to add to  
18 that is that I.V. would certainly be opposing interlocutory  
19 appeal. It is our belief that, under the statute, they  
20 actually don't even have the right to make that interlocutory  
21 appeal yet. So that issue may be resolved sooner than six  
22 months, because I think the rights, if they have that right  
23 even right now, is certainly -- we know it's a live issue, and  
24 that will be resolved even before they get to the merits in the  
25 interlocutory appeal, assuming the appeal request that was made

1 is even proper.

2 MR. ADAMO: Your Honor, I don't disagree that we've  
3 been informed by some other filings in Judge Hellerstein's  
4 court that that's I.V.'s position. We don't agree obviously at  
5 all. And, yes, I gather what I.V. is saying is that there is  
6 going to be early motion practice in front of the Federal  
7 Circuit on the point once the appeal is docketed and the  
8 decisions are made on motions to expedite, et cetera, which are  
9 certainly going to be filed in that appeal.

10 How long a briefing cycle that will take and this,  
11 we're sort of off because the statute is new, as the Court is  
12 aware, we're off in new terrain here. How long will it take  
13 the circuit to decide that and what kind of briefing cycle  
14 they'll set up on that, neither I.V. nor myself can speculate  
15 on that. We just don't know. We'll do -- obviously we'll do  
16 whatever they think is appropriate.

17 THE COURT: Well, let me circle back to sort of my --  
18 the principal concerns I've raised that don't appear to be  
19 shared by the parties in this case, which is, if, in fact,  
20 there are lots of judges being asked to interpret the same  
21 claim terms, what is the -- well, why isn't there more interest  
22 amongst you to try to do this in a more global fashion? And so  
23 why are there so many -- is it a lack of willingness? Is there  
24 some economic litigation strategy by having these multiple  
25 cases before multiple judges? Why isn't there more of a spirit

1 of, how can we do this more efficiently and get some resolution  
2 so that we can decide where everybody stands with respect to  
3 these patents.

4 MR. BELLOLI: Your Honor, this is Marc Belloli. And  
5 I think, from the plaintiff's perspective, each of these  
6 lawsuits were filed. The defendants -- sometime -- there's  
7 been a lot of case law developed over the last few years on,  
8 on, on choice of venue. So there certainly was at one point  
9 about putting everyone in Delaware. We can't put everyone in  
10 Delaware, even though most of the folks are incorporated there,  
11 but some aren't. So getting the cases to appropriate venues is  
12 the first challenge.

13 And then after that, like you said, there does lack  
14 some efficiencies. But, you know, as a plaintiff, you need to  
15 find venue for the defendants first, which is what puts us in  
16 the situation that we're in.

17 THE COURT: Well, do the defendants all like to  
18 litigate these separately? Or is there -- if there was a way  
19 to consolidate it, would there be a kind of a sense that that  
20 would be an efficient and maybe helpful thing to do? Or does  
21 everybody want to defend these separately.

22 MR. BELLOLI: This is Marc Belloli again. I can't  
23 speak for defendants, but, I mean, I could see, notwithstanding  
24 the inefficiencies of being in the different venues, that, say,  
25 the defendant that's seventh in line -- there are seven cases

1 involving these patents -- would like them separated because  
2 then they get six cases before them where there's chances for  
3 things to go wrong for the plaintiff. So I can see why certain  
4 defendants might want them separately.

5 THE COURT: Well, why don't we let Mr. Adamo tell us  
6 what his reasons are.

7 MR. BELLOLI: Yeah.

8 MR. ADAMO: Well, Your Honor, with all due respect,  
9 I.V. chose the hand that they dealt. And that's the hand  
10 that's been, that's been played out. Defendants had nothing to  
11 do with that. And I'm sorry I'm going to have to say this to  
12 this Court, but this is a subject, Your Honor, that I'm not  
13 authorized even by SunTrust to talk about today.

14 I'm certainly not authorized by the other defendants  
15 in the other cases, even though I'm co-counsel, to talk about  
16 this with the Court today. And to the extent these subjects  
17 may have been raised, again, I'm sorry, it's with the greatest  
18 respect, this would go into attorney-client privilege, work  
19 product matters that I am not free to divulge to the Court.

20 I try not to be obstructive here, Your Honor, but I'm  
21 afraid I can't contribute much to this particular line of  
22 discussion that you're raising, at least so far. I'm just --  
23 for privilege reasons, for work product reasons, but more than  
24 anything else, I'm just not authorized to talk about this today  
25 because no one expected that this subject was going to come up.

1           THE COURT: I understand.

2           MR. ADAMO: I am sorry, Your Honor. I'm very  
3 uncomfortable having to tell you this, but I'm constrained to  
4 have the discussion.

5           THE COURT: No, I understand that. I mean, I've got  
6 my own suspicions. But, but it doesn't, it doesn't move me off  
7 my concern that, with as many now Federal District Court judges  
8 involved in these cases, that it's sensical to proceed the way  
9 that it's proceeding.

10          MR. ADAMO: Your Honor, one thing that I would --  
11 that I would note as you're thinking about this, because of the  
12 jurisdictions that I.V. chose to file these cases, some other  
13 courts have patent rules, which I know Your Honor is familiar  
14 with. Some don't.

15                 Interestingly, Southern New York has patent rules,  
16 but, literally, the first day we showed up in Judge  
17 Hellerstein's court, Judge Hellerstein announced that we  
18 weren't using the patent rules. He made a decision that, on  
19 his discretion, we were not using the patent rules.

20                 So instead of a pattern of preset discovery taking  
21 place before the Markman claim construction was raised and  
22 adjudicated by him, the first thing that was done was, the  
23 Markman was done. So as a result of the selection of these  
24 various venues, unusual unexpected things have been happening  
25 here.

1           Whether that would complicate or drive any decision  
2 or views on the various defendant parties in the other cases or  
3 in this case, again, I'm not free to discuss that at this time  
4 for the reasons I've raised. But I don't want -- I appreciate  
5 I.V.'s counsel's advocacy here. I don't want Your Honor  
6 feeling that staying and litigating on the ground that I.V.  
7 chose is driven on the part of any of the defendants to not act  
8 in accordance with Rule 1 of the Federal Rules of Civil  
9 Procedure or otherwise act in an appropriate ethical manner  
10 here.

11           This, this -- I don't want a sense of the pejorative  
12 here that somehow, like playing the hand that I.V. dealt, any  
13 of the defendants are trying to game the system. With all  
14 respect to everybody on the phone, that's just an inappropriate  
15 suggestion.

16           Defendants didn't choose to be sued, and they didn't  
17 choose which patents to be sued on, and they didn't choose  
18 which venues to be sued in. That was up to I.V.

19           THE COURT: Well, the only thing I'll take from this  
20 conversation is that I at least know there are two different  
21 views of the litigation. I read between the lines that there  
22 must be a huge amount of money at issue, which is why there are  
23 various litigation strategies that are being employed. But I  
24 don't have a sense of which -- what they are or whether they  
25 are right or not.



1           The only conclusion I reach is just a practical one  
2 as one of several judges trying to preside over this, that it's  
3 always my interest to find a way, if possible, to promote  
4 efficiency and to promote consistency in judicial  
5 decision-making. And, and I guess I will continue to be guided  
6 by those two concerns because I think institutionally that's  
7 required of me.

8           And I'll say, in communicating with my colleagues,  
9 they all share the same concerns that I do. Sometimes it just  
10 takes somebody to poll everybody to see if the concerns are  
11 shared. It's just hard to do that, as I have learned, by the  
12 way, by starting this discussion. It's taken a lot of work and  
13 time, and -- but I still think it was the right thing to do.  
14 And I wanted you to know it.

15           So -- but as -- I want to make sure everybody  
16 understands that all we've done collectively is try to gather  
17 information to see what the landscape is to see whether there  
18 are options to promote judicial efficiency and consistency in  
19 interpretation but that no decisions have been made. And  
20 that's largely the result from the fact that so many of the  
21 judges have stayed their cases, which I have not yet done  
22 because I really haven't thought enough about it because of my  
23 personal docket and things that -- as important as this is to  
24 you, there are other people that have to get my time first.

25           So I'm trying to be thoughtful about what I do and

1 when I do it.

2 So the practical issue in this case is, I do need  
3 more time before I get to the motion to stay. But I don't  
4 think it makes any sense to require discovery to be conducted  
5 when, in fact, if I decided to stay that that discovery might  
6 become stale or unnecessary if I were to stay waiting for the  
7 result of the inter partes review. So I think the idea, at  
8 least to give me more breathing room and remove from you the  
9 burden of spending time and money on discovery that might not  
10 be efficient to do right now, would be to, to tell you that you  
11 should not conduct discovery in my case until you hear from me  
12 on the motion to stay. And then depending upon what that  
13 result is, if it's -- if we move forward, we will have a second  
14 conference, either by phone or in person, to decide what the  
15 process will be.

16 We do have patent rules. I've had enough patent  
17 cases to have mixed emotions about whether or not I ought to be  
18 enslaved to the rules or whether I ought to think more  
19 practically about it in each case what makes sense. But the  
20 overall structure of them helps. I just don't know if I'll  
21 say, you know, we're just going to rotely follow the patent  
22 rules, because I haven't gotten that far.

23 So let me go ahead and just stay discovery in this  
24 case until I rule on the motion to stay.

25 MR. BELLOLI: Your Honor, Marc Belloli. If I may,

1 just one point, and then I'm not going to contest Your Honor's  
2 ruling on that. Just one item.

3 There is a deposition tomorrow in this case. It's a  
4 deposition that, you know, both sides are obviously preparing  
5 for currently, I think. And, like you said, in the interest of  
6 not duplicating efforts and things like that, you know, if you  
7 lift the stay or you don't and stay the case entirely pending  
8 the outcome of the RPRs, this deposition would then have to be  
9 rescheduled and go forward, so I would request, with Your  
10 Honor's permission, just to go forward with that one deposition  
11 tomorrow. I think that makes sense from a class standpoint and  
12 an efficiency standpoint as people are already traveling to  
13 handle that deposition.

14 MR. PAINE: And, Your Honor, this is Eugene Paige of  
15 Keker & Van Nest representing SunTrust. We believe that, you  
16 know, Mr. Hoff could go and do his own work. But, you know, it  
17 makes sense to allow him to do that. The lawyers can all go  
18 home, and he can have his own job back tomorrow rather than  
19 sitting for a deposition and taking time out that might not be  
20 necessary. So we suggest that the stay should enter now and we  
21 can let him know he can return to his work duties for tomorrow.

22 THE COURT: Where is he and where is the deposition  
23 to be conducted and who is it?

24 MR. PAIGE: In Atlanta, Your Honor.

25 THE COURT: Pardon me?

1 MR. PAIGE: In Atlanta, Your Honor.

2 THE COURT: And so who would actually be traveling to  
3 Atlanta to participate in the deposition tomorrow?

4 MR. BELLOLI: Counsel for Intellectual Ventures.

5 THE COURT: And who is that that's going to take it?

6 MR. BELLOLI: David Rudolph.

7 THE COURT: And is he actually in Atlanta now?

8 MR. BELLOLI: I don't know of his actual whereabouts  
9 right now. I don't know if he's already gotten on a plane or  
10 not. I'm not privy to the actual travel schedule. But I can  
11 send him an e-mail right now.

12 THE COURT: If he hasn't traveled yet, why don't you  
13 tell him not to travel. If he has, SunTrust, if they want this  
14 stay, will reimburse him for his travel expense.

15 MR. PAIGE: Thank you, Your Honor.

16 THE COURT: It's -- and, Mr. Belloli, my thought is  
17 that if there -- whatever happens in these cases, I don't know  
18 if he would need to be deposed by others or others would want  
19 to participate in it. I don't know. Maybe that's a remote  
20 idea. But it seems that -- I would like to put everything on  
21 hold until I make my decision.

22 MR. BELLOLI: That sounds good, Your Honor. I think  
23 the deposition actually is more specific to SunTrust. But  
24 we'll -- I mean, I don't think that's either here nor there.  
25 And we'll obviously abide by Your Honor's ruling.

1           THE COURT: All right. Anything else that you would  
2 like to discuss while we're all together?

3           MR. ADAMO: Your Honor, it's Ken Adamo again. Would  
4 the Court like us to keep you informed of -- by us, I mean,  
5 obviously, Ms. Day and her team, I.V., and the JPMC lawyers --  
6 would you like us to keep you advised of what's going on in the  
7 interlocutory appeal?

8           THE COURT: Very much so.

9           MR. ADAMO: I'll make sure, I'll make sure we, we do  
10 that in coordination with I.V., Your Honor.

11          THE COURT: Okay. That would help me.

12          All right. Anything else?

13          MR. PAIGE: Not from SunTrust, Your Honor. Thank  
14 you.

15          THE COURT: Mr. Belloli?

16          MS. DAY: Thank you, Judge.

17          MR. BELLOLI: Thank you, Judge.

18          MR. ADAMO: Your Honor, thank you very much for your  
19 time. And thank you very much for your efforts as you related  
20 them to us this morning. We appreciate it.

21          THE COURT: Well, thank you. And thanks for being  
22 available so that we could hold this call this week.

23          MR. PAIGE: Thank you, Your Honor.

24          THE COURT: Thanks a lot. Have a good weekend.

25          MR. BELLOLI: You, too, Your Honor. Take care.

(Proceedings concluded at 11:40 a.m.)

- - -

C E R T I F I C A T E

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA

I do hereby certify that the foregoing pages are a  
true and correct copy of the proceedings in the case aforesaid.

This, the 15th day of August, 2014.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Elizabeth G. Cohn, CCR-B-872  
Official Court Reporter  
United States District Court